

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 have been examined in the application. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the subject matter. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claim 6. Claim 6 has been canceled. Claims 1-5 and 7-14 are pending. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 102

Claims 1 and 3-14 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Chern et al. having publication number US2003/0060211 (Chern). According to the Office action:

Regarding claim 6, Chern disclose that the monitoring step (712) includes requesting wireless terminal location update events from a wireless network mobile location server and monitoring said update events as they are received (see Fig. 12, section [80]).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 6 and disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Chern. The text pointed to by the Examiner does not discuss **requesting** wireless terminal location update events **from** a wireless network mobile location **server** and monitoring said update events as they are received as recited in claim 6. The use of the current techniques allow geographic areas to be defined that correlate with the mobile terminal location information provided by the home location server 16. (see page 7, lines 23-25 of the current application)

In Chern, referring to step 712 of FIG. 12, the handset 130 periodically sends updated location and user preference information to server 136. (see section [80] of Chern) That is, although the handset **sends** location information to the server 136, Chern does **not** disclose a technique where such information is **requested** from the server. In sharp contrast, in the present invention, the method of claim 6 recites a step that includes **requesting** wireless terminal location update events **from** a wireless network mobile

location server and monitoring said update events as they are received. In other words, the server in the current application is "active" because it requests information, whereas the server in Chern is "passive" because it waits for information from the terminal. Accordingly, claim 6 is not anticipated by Chern for at least this reason. Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claim 6. Consequently, amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Chern for at least the reasons above.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chern in view of Murray having an application number US2002/0068583 (Murray).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claim 6, which for the reasons given above, should be allowable. Since claim 2 depends on claim 1, claim 2 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Request for Reconsideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the Office Action mailed on December 24, 2003, Applicants request reconsideration in the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow claims 1-5, 7-14 and pass the application to issue. If there is any point requiring further attention prior to allowance, the Examiner is asked to contact Applicants' counsel who can be reached at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully,
Wolfgang Fleischer

By Claude R. Narcisse
Claude R. Narcisse
Reg. No. 38979
(201) 801-3190

April 20, 2004